

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/815,251 | CHANG ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Tamra L. Dicus | 1774 | |

All Participants:

(1) Tamra L. Dicus.

(2) Peter Brunoski.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 25 October 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Obvious Double Patenting rejection over USPN 6,897,168

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

The Examiner pointed out that '168 claims substantially the same material while the word "triggerable" is not claimed. Applicant agreed to send in a Terminal Disclaimer to obviate an Obvious Double Patenting Rejection.

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)